



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

which enables only the surname to be given, thus giving slight intimation of the literature of the subject, in the case of little-known authorities. The illustrations are numerous, and some of them excellent, particularly the head-cuts to chapters; but the full-page pictures are often merely fanciful, while the presence of some of the well-executed portraits can be justified only by chance allusions in the text.

Mechanically, the index presents a good appearance; but a slight examination reveals serious errors both of omission and commission, and in general all the crudities characteristic of the volume. We can here mention but a few examples: Green Bay is credited to Michigan, and is given but two citations; but we find it mentioned in at least a half-dozen other places in the text. Hennepin is awarded but one citation; we have found him, nevertheless, on at least two other pages. The same is the case with Langlade and many other characters in the story. For a long account in the text, there is given but the first page in the stretch; and a familiar method is merely to cite the chapter in which a statement occurs. Many names and events mentioned in the text are here ignored. This is a lazy man's index-making, and closely approaches the methods sometimes met with in our federal documents.

In the absence of any other one book upon the market which covers this broad field in such detail as the Spears-Clark history, it will temporarily meet a certain need; but so crude a piece of work cannot become a standard.

R. G. THWAITES.

The Bernards of Abington and Nether Winchendon. A Family History. By MRS. NAPIER HIGGINS. (New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1903. Two vols., pp. x, 348; viii, 364.)

THE last scion of the last known branch of these Bernards has felt called upon to publish this record of the family. Owing to the destruction and loss of documents, Mrs. Higgins has found the writing of the history laborious, but notwithstanding this she has succeeded by diligent industry, with the aid of various publications available for laborers in this field, in compiling two volumes on her chosen topic, and promises those who are interested in her work to follow these with two others for which the materials at her command are more ample. To the general reader, the story of the career of the Bernards, whether conjectural or supported by authentic records, is of little interest. What concerns us is that Sir Francis Bernard, the whilom governor of the province of Massachusetts Bay, traced his descent from one of the lines of this family, and that after the reader reaches the middle of the first volume he is practically dealing with a life of the governor.

Bernard came to America in 1758, bringing with him his wife and four of his eight children. For two uneventful years he governed the province of New Jersey, during which time his family was increased by two American-born children. He showed some tact during this period in his dealings with the natives, and considerable judgment in his treat-

ment of the Quakers, who at that time formed a powerful and respectable body in the province of New Jersey. In August, 1760, Bernard assumed the government of the province of Massachusetts Bay. Quebec had fallen the year before. French rule in Canada was then breathing its last at Montreal. Thereafter British loyalty was not to be stimulated by appeals for men to capture Louisburg, to defend Crown Point, or to lay siege to Fort Frontenac. With the assurance of British domination in Nova Scotia and Canada came a respite to the chronic fears of attack from the Indians of the northeast. Thus relieved from the pressure of patriotism evoked by martial calls, the great political questions which had ever been present in colonial affairs, whether consciously or unconsciously, began once more to assert themselves. Not at first aggressively, nor in the early days of the governor's administration in such a way as seriously to disturb the harmony which existed within the government. For four years, indeed, Bernard escaped anything more than mere friction; and the assurance which had been made to him when he entered upon the government "that he might depend upon a quiet and easy administration" seemed still to be within reach of possible realization.

Then came the troubles brought about by the change of attitude of the English government through its great need for money; the enforcement of obnoxious imports; the attempt to collect revenue through a Stamp Act; the consequent outbreaks in Boston, and the wanton destruction of property owned by obnoxious individuals; the landing of troops there; the repeal of the Stamp Act; and the substitution of the Townshend taxes. During this period the relations of the governor, the representative of law and order and the upholder of royal prerogative, with the assembly which for a time refused compensation to the sufferers through these riotous proceedings, became strained to the utmost extent; and Bernard, who on arrival was welcomed with enthusiasm, found himself in the midst of a people who held him in personal disfavor. For the first time in the history of the province, the council was openly opposed to the governor. The assembly even went so far as to petition for his removal. Spurned by the people of Boston, he found no consolation in turning to the commissioners whom he had not been able to protect, or to the naval officers who had come to Boston to protect him. Commodore Hood, indeed, openly charged him with timidity and wrote contemptuously of his administration of affairs.

Under such circumstances, one who writes a life of the person who has thus lost his popularity will feel called upon to ask what was his agency in producing this state of affairs, and will endeavor to show how far a cultivated, amiable, and well-meaning gentleman like Bernard, whose delight it was to hear his daughter play upon the harpsichord; who found recreation in composing Greek and Latin odes; and who evidently earnestly wished for the prosperity and happiness of his people, was personally accountable for this change of opinion, and how far it was due to events absolutely beyond his control.

Without undertaking to sustain Mrs. Higgins in the attitude which

she assumes upon some of the political questions of the day, it will be readily admitted that most, if not all, of the obloquy which was heaped upon Bernard by contemporary Americans and by the early American historians was unmerited. It was his misfortune in consequence of his official duties to be the target towards which abuse was directed. We appreciate now that the conversion of a mercantile venture with its headquarters in London, whose sole original purpose was to line the pockets of its stock-holders, into a detached government having control over a large and prosperous population with new and individual interests and legislating for a people absolutely without thought of return to the mother-country, carried with it inevitable conflict as to the jurisdiction of the lawmaking bodies on either side the Atlantic. There was no precedent by which this question could be settled, and there was no probability of a peaceable solution for it, a fact not at that time appreciated. From the days of the quo warranto in 1635 down to the Declaration of Independence, except possibly in the time of the Commonwealth, the conflict was chronic. Leaders turned up in the province opportunely. Elisha Cooke, "the Oliver Cromwell of New England," who sought to save from the shipwreck of the Old Charter some of the liberties embodied in it, passed on his power to his son of the same name; and Samuel Adams worked along lines devised by his predecessors. Had there been no Cookes and no Adamses, others would have filled their places. Had it not been Bernard, then some other representative of the Crown and supporter of prerogative would have been the object of special detestation of the Massachusetts people when the crisis came. The conflict with all its concomitants was irrepressible, and the bitter feelings and hard words which accompanied it were inevitable.

A generalization of this sort would not suffice for the writer of a family history by way of apology or explanation for the unpopularity of the hero. We need not be surprised therefore to find that Mrs. Higgins turns to such sources of information as she has at command for aid in solving these questions. Original papers of the period she has not. Moreover she is not specially equipped for her purposes by familiar knowledge with provincial history or with life in Boston. On this latter point, the manuscript reminiscences of one of the family, then too young to comprehend what she saw, throw a feeble light. Except for this, the composite account which she gives of Bernard's career, with occasional sketches of the leaders of the loyal and patriot forces in Boston, is made up from publications dealing with the subjects. Lecky is the political authority upon whom she relies during the earlier stages of the conflict. Belsham's *George the Third* is freely quoted later on. Rees's *Cyclopædia* is turned to for statistical and geographical information. The *Memorial History of Boston* furnishes the necessary topographical and social details. Hutchinson, Chalmers, Bancroft, and Sabine all contribute their quotas, and the diaries of Hutchinson and John Adams are freely used. Even the weird fancies of Hawthorne are allowed their swing, when the old Province House is described. No one work is perhaps

more fully relied upon for sketches of the patriots than Hosmer's *Samuel Adams*.

The mosaic account thus furnished is skilfully constructed and, although the author is somewhat hampered by her relation to the subject, it may be said to be fairly done, the exceptions she takes to some of the language used by Bancroft being justifiable and her own conclusions being without undue prejudice. The value of the account is greatly increased by copious quotations from a life of Sir Francis Bernard, written by his son Thomas, and privately printed in 1790. No copy of this work has found its way into our libraries, and it consequently escapes mention by Sabin. The writer, Thomas Bernard, was summoned by his father from Harvard College to assume the duties of his private secretary. Thus at the age of sixteen he was placed in a position where he would be impressed by the course of events. In later life he acquired great distinction by his philanthropic writings and work, and even as a young man he keenly appreciated the opportunity furnished the poor man in the province through the absence of an aristocracy. The value of the numerous quotations from this hitherto unknown work will be readily appreciated, and all will unite in regrets that the book was not reprinted in its entirety.

Of Bernard's own publications his *Select Letters* are freely used. So also his *Principles of Law and Polity applied to the American Colonies*, an ill-advised attempt to reform the colonial governments which aided greatly in bringing him into discredit in Boston, written in 1764 and published with *Select Letters*, etc. Three pamphlets containing Bernard's letters were contemporaneously published by his opponents. One of these, *Letters to the Ministry*, etc., is cited.

It is perhaps proper to state in this connection that still another political pamphlet, published in 1774, *The Causes of the Present Distractions in America*, etc., is attributed by Sabin to Sir Francis Bernard. Believing as I do, that it was not written by Bernard, I do not take exceptions to the fact that the author does not allude to it. I cannot, however, pass by the omission to examine Bernard's official correspondence on file in the Record Office. What if the thirteen volumes purchased by Sparks were in the library of Harvard College, and were inaccessible to her? It did not require that she should cross the Atlantic to examine the copies preserved by Bernard, when by going down Fetter or Chancery Lane she could see the originals, or at any rate most of them. This neglect reveals the great defect of these volumes. Mrs. Higgins has been too self-reliant. Industrious, skilful, animated by the best of intentions, and the mistress of considerable literary ability, she could have made her life of Bernard a standard authority if she had taken the advice of some competent historical worker, and used the resources within her reach with greater discrimination. It would hardly be fair to hold her to invariable accuracy in the quotations which she makes from authors upon whom she relies. There is one statement, however, in a paragraph relative to the laws of the province taken from Thomas Bernard's life of his father, which can-

not be passed by without protest. He says "under the Theocracy the violation of the Sabbath was high-treason and was avenged by death." Sir Thomas unquestionably meant to be truthful. The account of the laws of the province and the operations of the government quoted from his work is as a whole intelligent and accurate. It is important, therefore, to note this exception, which can doubtless be traced to Cotton's proposed *Abstract of the Lawes of New England*.

ANDREW MCFARLAND DAVIS.

Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland. By WILLIAM EDWARD HARTPOLE LECKY. (New York and London: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1903. Pp. xxi, 321; x, 358.)

THIS work in its original form, as we learn from the preface of the new revision, was first published anonymously in 1861, when the author was but twenty-two years old. The work was a failure on the market, only about thirty copies being sold. In 1871 the author republished his biographies over his own name, with an introduction on Irish affairs. This edition, coming in the midst of the exciting discussions on the Irish question that followed the Fenian outbreak of 1867, the Irish Land Act, and the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish church in 1870, attracted more attention; but the volume received but little attention from the reading public until the conversion of Mr. Gladstone to Home Rule a few years later. Mr. Gladstone appealed to Mr. Lecky's work as a justification of his policy. He made political use of Mr. Lecky's contention that a distinct national feeling lay at the base of Irish discontent; that no government "will ever permanently command the affection and loyalty of the Irish people which is not in some degree national, which is not administered in a great measure by Irishmen and through Irish institutions." But Mr. Lecky was by no means a believer in Gladstone's Home Rule policy. Because he had condemned the Union of 1800 it did not follow that he favored its repeal in 1880. He held that a Parliament like that of 1800, representing the loyalty and landed property of the island, was quite unlike one representing an extreme democracy, or the Irish Land League, which was "certain to be guided by men who had long made it their task to stimulate in every form the most passionate hatred of the British Empire and who would probably begin their legislation by the plunder of the very classes of which Grattan's Parliament mainly consisted."

In his Irish policy Mr. Lecky favored giving Ireland "the greatest amount of self-government that is compatible with the unity and security of the Empire." He was stoutly opposed to the Irish Nationalists and their programme, and he therefore rejected the creation of a dependent Irish Parliament; much more would he oppose the creation of an independent one. He favored the enlargement of local government for Ireland, "directed by the loyal and property classes." But he held that the danger of an independent or subordinate Parliament, which seemed great in 1871, had become incomparably greater at the time of